

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action claims 1-6, 8-24, and 26-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Jansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,585,709). Further, claims 7 and 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jansen et al. in view of Boyer (U.S. Patent No. 4,485,796). Finally, the Examiner states that the Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-6, 8-24, and 26-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Jansen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,585,709), Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

In the previous Office Action, Applicants amended formerly dependent claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 17, and 18 to be independent claims incorporating the subject matter of respective rejected base claims 1, 9 and 16. In doing so, Applicants canceled rejected base claims 1, 9 and 16 without prejudice. Therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 9 and 16 is believed to be in error, as these claims are no longer pending in the application.

Regarding the rejection of claims 2-6, 8, 10-15, 17-24, and 26-27 to Jansen, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection for reasons stated in the March 14, 2002 Amendment and Request for Reconsideration.

Similarly, regarding the rejection of claims 7 and 25 to Jansen in view of Boyer, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection for reasons stated in the March 14, 2002 Amendment and Request for Reconsideration.

37 C.F.R. 1.113(b) requires that an Examiner "state all grounds of rejection then considered applicable to the claims in the application, clearly stating the reasons in support thereof". Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner has failed to

comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.113(b) in the response to Applicants' March 14, 2002 Amendment and Request for Reconsideration.

For example, in the Final Office Action, the Examiner has simply relisted grounds of rejection previously stated in his December 14, 2001 non-final action and has ignored Applicants' arguments that are believed to overcome the Examiner's rejections. The Examiner also indicated that "Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) for rejection" without providing what the new ground(s) are. Applicants believe this reply is insufficient under 37 C.F.R. 1.113(b).

Further, with regards to claims 15, 24, and 27, the Examiner provides no specific pinpoint reference indicating that the sensorless control electric machine drive in Jansen could include a Lundell-type synchronous machine, a sensorless control induction machine, or a surface permanent magnet synchronous machine. Applicants are left to speculate as to whether the removal of "a buried permanent magnet synchronous motor" from claims 15, 24, and 27 would result in allowable claims.

Similarly, with respect to claim 8, the Examiner provides no specific pinpoint reference indicating that the plurality of sensor slots are coupled with a plurality of stator slots of the stator are found in Jansen. Without such reference, Applicants respectfully suggest that a 102(b) rejection to claim 8 cannot be upheld.


Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner has failed to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.113(b) because no new grounds for rejection have been stated following the Applicants' amendment and because the Examiner has not stated specific reasons for rejecting each claim. Applicants respectfully request removal from Final rejection status or, alternatively, an appropriate explanation that complies with 37 C.F.R. 1.113(b) as to why the arguments were considered moot and the action therefore made Final.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 2-8, 10-15, and 17-27 are all in proper form and patently distinguish from the prior art. Accordingly, allowance of the claim and passage of the application to issuance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (248) 223-9500 if any matters remain unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.



Steven W. Hays
Reg. No. 41,823
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: July 16, 2002

FAX COPY RECEIVED

JUL 16 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800